SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Meeting of Friday, October 2, 1992
Room GM-600-04, 13:00

Present: P. Bird, A. Braun (recording sect'y.), T. Bui (Chair), S. Chowdhury, A. Homzy, A.B. Ibrahim, R. Johnston, K. Lypke, D. Markiewicz, T. Sankar, P. Shizgal, K. Thulasiraman, A. Williams

Regrets: U. de Brentani, C. Nero

Guests: M. Cohen, C. Hyde

---

1. Approval of Agenda.

Agenda was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes of the April 16, 1992 meeting

Minutes were approved. The **Chair** was not sure he understood item #6 on page 4. Dr. T. Sankar explained that there were a number of documents produced and submitted to the Vice-Rector, Academic. The Task Force requested that the Vice-Rector, Academic put together a committee to look into this matter and prioritize what could be done to enhance research in terms of not only activities, but also supporting facilities on a 3 year period.

The **Chair** knows of only two ad-hoc committees related to this document, one being the Ad-hoc Committee of Planning & Priorities, chaired by Dr. R. Parker, and the other being in regards to support services for Research, chaired by Dr. C. Bertrand.

T. Sankar said that those are related to Senate. The Task Force should be sub-committe of SRC to report to those sub-committees mentioned by the **Chair**.

P. Shizgal said that SRC developed certain principles & proposals in response to the document that went to Senate. Implementation comes from the Vice-Rector Services who was charged to make a task force to report to SRC. Senate produced the policy which was then passed on to SRC.

3. Introductions and welcome to new members

Introductions were made.

4. Report of the Chair.

The **Chair** Attended many CREPUQ mettings and said that they are preparing a document on policies for joint research grants between universities due to indirect cost calculations. There has to be a policy in which one can decide what amount of money should go to which university. **Concordia** has been

asked for input and a document should be coming out in a few months. He recommended that the committee look at this document carefully.

He recently met with most directors of Research Centres and has visited a few centres. One problem seemed to be that some centres are small and more like service centres than research centres. A criteria should be set to clearly define what a research centre should be.

He also visited NSERC and SSHRC with Audrey Williams. Highlights of these visits were circulated. He noted that NSERC was launching a new program. This is for collaboration between Faculty members and researchers within and outside Canada. Deadline is April 1993. The Budget for the first year is $10 million and will be increased to $28 million in two years.

On August 13, they visited SSHRC and met with Ms. Leduc and the directors. This new council will take on the task of the International Cultural & Academic Relations Programme of External Affairs. An interesting item for Ms. Lypke is that he asked Ms. Leduc about the possibility of giving Canada Council grants through the University. Dr. Parker has suggested that this be implemented. Ms. Leduc promised to look into it. Ms. Lypke is to discuss this with faculty before Dr. Bui puts in the request to Council.

The **Chair** also reported that his office has received the proposal for a Composite Material Research Center. An ad-hoc Committee was struck and met twice. It's work is now completed, and a report was sent to Dean Swamy.

The last item he wanted to mention was the document on scientific integrity. This document is now part of a comprehensive document on many other matters and is now at the Rector's ofice for discussion. It will be returned to SRC for discussion in the near future.

5. Report of the Director, Office of Research Services

- **Internal Distribution of Research Funds for Faculty, 1991-1992**

A.J. Williams noted that the Office of Research Services had received Annual Reports from the four Faculties on how they distributed the funds. Data outlining the breakdown of funds and breakdown of faculty departments was sent to Québec.

She noted that the strategic grant period may be pushed by two weeks. The document will be out in beginning of November. She noted a drop in FCAR applications, 22 applications as opposed to 32 for last year. The Office of Research Services is now working on NSERC and SSHRC.

The **Chair** noted **Concordia**'s rankinng in terms of SSHRC for 1991-92 was 14 and that for 92-93, 11. In terms of Social Sciences, **Concordia** is doing as well as other universities.

A.J. Williams noted that there was a correlation with FRDP bridge funding. More information will be out in November.

With regards to the new Collaborative Project Programme of NSERC, it was recommended that this be given good publicity. Faculty should know about it now, the sooner the better, otherwise some

groups may not have time to prepare their material. The important thing is collaboration. At the NSERC meeting, they were told that 1,200 applications were expected.

It was noted that lead time is important.

In conclusion, **Concordia**'s relationship with NSERC is very good.

6. Selection of representatives for Humanities and Computer Sciences

Six nominations were presented, 3 per section. The **Chair** made the following recommendations, in the following order:

P.M. Lightbowm, S. Simon & P. Allen: Humanities
C.Y. Suen, C. Lam & H.F. Li: Computer Sciences

There followed a long discussion regarding the composition of the Senate Research Committee. Some of the concerns were:

- Some members inquired about how nominees were chosen
- The **Chair** noted that this committee follows the practice and mandate that was approved by Senate.
- It was pointed out that the process for nomination is the same as with previous years.
- Members are representing the discipline, not the department, nor colleagues.
- Some were not quite sure about the structure of this committee and its' sub-committees.
- Some were not sure about the legal composition of the committee.

After a lengthy debate:

- Motion to accept the following order: P.M. Lightbowm, S. Simon and P. Allen for Humanities was put forward by K. Lypke and seconded by D. Markiewicz.
- Motion to accept the following order: C. Lam, C.Y. Suen and H.F. Li for Computer Science was put forward by T. Sankar and seconded by S. Chowdhury.

A vote was taken, and both nominations were accepted. Audrey Williams will contact the nominees in that order for their acceptance.

7. The Capital Campaign - Draft Table of Needs (SRC-92-9-D1a-b-c)

The **Chair** introduced Dr. M. Cohen and Mr. C. Hyde. **Dr. Cohen** gave us a brief background regarding the campaign.

Capital campaign was finished in 1988 and **Concordia** is now in the process of inaugurating and profiting of the fruits of many years. The next campaign is now being planned. **Concordia** first started by hiring a director of advancement. It was noted that fund raising should be done by people who know best what the object of raising is. Planning was officially started two years ago. Deans, Associate Vice-Rectors, Vice-Rectors, Directors of athletics, student leaders, were asked to put together their priorities and what they foresaw as their needs which would be fulfilled by the capital campaign. A

committee was developed to try to distill these requests in a draft table of needs which should reflect the plans and priorities of **Concordia**.

The committee met with all chairs, except for the faculties of Arts & Science, and Fine Arts, to make sure that they get involved in the choosing of priorities.

Concordia is next in line after McGill. **C. Hyde** said that **Concordia** should aim for $50 million, commenting that the odds are that it will be difficult to go for more than $75 million. He recommends to resist pressure to go lower that $50 million.

He noted that it took 14 drafts to get the Capital Campaign Committee to agree with this.

The Chairs and professorships are the 2 major headings, the other major heading is in regards to labs. There are some things in the Faculty of Arts & Science that just can't wait for 10 years.

C. Hyde said there was a need to develop needs of support and subcases.

M. Cohen pointed out that writing the case for support is the major item that needs to be worked on. The second thing is timing. Most money comes from large donors. We need to establish an endowment policy. He basically got an agreement that 7% would be the payout with the balance to go into the fund. He noted that the pension fund averaged 10% beyond inflation and that interest rates are 4% beyond inflation.

He noted that gifts should not be taxed and maybe left out all together. The endowment policy has been approved. Another thing which has been approved is spending of the pre-campaign proposed budget of $714,000.

There followed a brief question period. The following points were raised:

T. Sankar asked when would the official kickoff be and what will be the duration of the campaign? Will it be anounced?

C. Hyde said that precise timing depends on the feasiblity study which will be in 1993. Timing will then become better known. He recommended not to announce the campaign to the public until approximately half the amount is raised.

T. Sankar noted that there was an enormous interest coming from the **Concordia** Alumni group in Malaysia and Hong Kong and were thinking of funding.

P. Bird was curious about the endowment policiy. There doesn't seem to be any interest in funds for equipment. This weans out , on average, every five years . Also, donors could perhaps be interested in an endowment fund that dies when they do.

C. Hyde said that in the last capital campaign, there had been self-exhausted endowments.

The **Chair** thanked Dr. Cohen and Mr. Hyde for their presentation.

8. Ad-hoc Committee for the Establishment of Policies and Procedures to evaluate existing research centres (SRC-92-10-D2)

The **Chair** referred to items #4 & 5 on page 4 of Document US-90-10-D19. Part of 4 is related to existing centres. #5 is to roll into this reporting of timetable schedule. Document US 90-10-D19 was approved in 1990 and one year later another document on guidelines for the evaluation of proposals for new centres was approved. What is lacking is a similar document for the evaluation of existing centres.

D. Markiewicz asked how will this be coordinated with the appraisal system?

P. Shizgal replied that in previous discussions, the idea was to coordinate existing centres. The focus of unit evaluation is academic. The idea is to try not to create additional paper work. This is not much of a problem for FCAR centre grant holders.

P. Bird noted that some centres were created and named as centres before any rules were established. He wondered which ones should be reviewed.

T. Sankar referred to item #3 of page 4 asking if that was what was being referring to? Will the centre come into existence using these guidelines?

The **Chair** replied affirmatively.

T. Sankar stated that the **Chair** must then contact the directors of existing centres so that we can get a dialogue going. It has to be done in consultation of directors of centres and personnel. This is a sensitive issue and thus should not become any more sensitive.

A. Ibrahim agreed that this was an important point. There are a lot of centers, especially in commerce, whose mandates is research, but they are also teaching centres, grouped under research centre. Evaluation of what is a research center should be more precise.

The **Chair** said that these policies could not come out of thin air and are motivated by similar documents elsewhere.

In terms of the definition of a centre, the criteria, the procedure to review, down to the level of who should be director, the **Chair** has collected documents from universities across Canada and they have documents that clearly define research groups, and anglophone universities are starting to copy francophone universities. We have already done an number of these things already but we still don't have any document which explains what is a centre, how do you define it, what is critical mass? How do we evaluate those centres, how do we choose directors? Some are chosen by Deans, some by departmental Chairs.

The **Chair** proposes an ad-hoc committee be struck to look at documents. But, he stressed that before embarking on the review, one has to know what one is reviewing.

Motion to agree to an ad-hoc committee was put forward by **A. Ibrahim** and seconded by **P. Bird,** with all in favor.

A vote was taken to determine who should form this committee. **T. Sankar** nominated **P. Shizgal, D. Markiewicz** seconded. All were in favor. **T. Sankar** then nominated **A. Ibrahim, K. Lypke** seconded. All were in favor. It was agreed that the third member will be chosen from one of the members at large.

9. Varia

Nothing

10. Adjournment.

Meeting was adjourned at 16:00. Time and date of next meeting to be announced soon.

file:...\src\agendas\oct292